



**University of  
Zurich**<sup>UZH</sup>

**Zurich Open Repository and  
Archive**

University of Zurich  
University Library  
Strickhofstrasse 39  
CH-8057 Zurich  
[www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)

---

Year: 2016

---

## The ecology and evolutionary dynamics of meiotic drive

Lindholm, Anna K ; Dyer, Kelly A ; Firman, Renée C ; Fishman, Lila ; Forstmeier, Wolfgang ; Holman, Luke ; Johannesson, Hanna ; Knief, Ulrich ; Kokko, Hanna ; Larracuente, Amanda M ; Manser, Andri ; Montchamp-Moreau, Catherine ; Petrosyan, Varos G ; Pomiankowski, Andrew ; Presgraves, Daven C ; Safronova, Larisa D ; Sutter, Andreas ; Unckless, Robert L ; Verspoor, Rudi L ; Wedell, Nina ; Wilkinson, Gerald S ; Price, Tom A R

**Abstract:** Meiotic drivers are genetic variants that selfishly manipulate the production of gametes to increase their own rate of transmission, often to the detriment of the rest of the genome and the individual that carries them. This genomic conflict potentially occurs whenever a diploid organism produces a haploid stage, and can have profound evolutionary impacts on gametogenesis, fertility, individual behaviour, mating system, population survival, and reproductive isolation. Multiple research teams are developing artificial drive systems for pest control, utilising the transmission advantage of drive to alter or exterminate target species. Here, we review current knowledge of how natural drive systems function, how drivers spread through natural populations, and the factors that limit their invasion.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.02.001>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-123579>

Journal Article

Accepted Version



The following work is licensed under a Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) License.

Originally published at:

Lindholm, Anna K; Dyer, Kelly A; Firman, Renée C; Fishman, Lila; Forstmeier, Wolfgang; Holman, Luke; Johannesson, Hanna; Knief, Ulrich; Kokko, Hanna; Larracuente, Amanda M; Manser, Andri; Montchamp-Moreau, Catherine; Petrosyan, Varos G; Pomiankowski, Andrew; Presgraves, Daven C; Safronova, Larisa D; Sutter, Andreas; Unckless, Robert L; Verspoor, Rudi L; Wedell, Nina; Wilkinson, Gerald S; Price, Tom A R (2016). The ecology and evolutionary dynamics of meiotic drive. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 31(4):315-326.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.02.001>

## Trends Box

- Both naturally occurring and synthetic “meiotic drivers” violate Mendel’s law of equal segregation and can rapidly spread through populations even when they reduce the fitness of individuals carrying them.
- Synthetic drivers are being developed to spread desirable genes in natural populations of target species. How ecology influences the population dynamics of meiotic drivers is important for predicting the success of synthetic drive elements.
- An enduring puzzle concerns why some meiotic drivers persist at stable, intermediate frequencies rather than sweeping to fixation.
- Drivers can have a wide range of consequences from extinction to changes in mating system.

# The ecology and evolutionary dynamics of meiotic drive

Anna K. Lindholm<sup>1</sup>, Kelly A. Dyer<sup>2</sup>, Renée C. Firman<sup>3</sup>, Lila Fishman<sup>4</sup>, Wolfgang Forstmeier<sup>5</sup>,  
Luke Holman<sup>6</sup>, Hanna Johannesson<sup>7</sup>, Ulrich Knief<sup>5</sup>, Hanna Kokko<sup>1</sup>, Amanda M. Larracuente<sup>8</sup>,  
Andri Manser<sup>1</sup>, Catherine Montchamp-Moreau<sup>9</sup>, Varos G. Petrosyan<sup>10</sup>, Andrew  
Pomiankowski<sup>11</sup>, Daven C. Presgraves<sup>8</sup>, Larisa D. Safronova<sup>10</sup>, Andreas Sutter<sup>1</sup>, Robert L.  
Unckless<sup>12</sup>, Rudi L. Verspoor<sup>13</sup>, Nina Wedell<sup>14</sup>, Gerald S. Wilkinson<sup>15</sup>, Tom A. R. Price<sup>13</sup>

1. Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of Zurich,  
Zurich, Switzerland

2. Department of Genetics, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA

3. Centre for Evolutionary Biology, School of Animal Biology, University of Western Australia,  
Perth, Western Australia 6009, Australia

4. Division of Biological Sciences, University of Montana, Missoula, MT, 59812, USA

5. Department of Behavioural Ecology and Evolutionary Genetics, Max Planck Institute for  
Ornithology, 82319 Seewiesen, Germany

6. Division of Ecology, Evolution & Genetics, Research School of Biology, Australian National  
University, Canberra, Australia

7. Department of Organismal Biology, Uppsala University, Norbyvägen 18D, 752 36 Uppsala,  
Sweden

8. Department of Biology, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York

9. Évolution Génomes Comportement & Ecologie, CNRS, IRD, Univ. Paris-Sud, Université  
Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

10. Severtsov Institute of Ecology and Evolution, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow,  
119071 Russia

11. Department of Genetics, Evolution and Environment, University College London, Gower  
Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK

12. Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York,  
USA

13. Institute of Integrative Biology, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZB, UK

14. Biosciences, University of Exeter, Cornwall Campus, Penryn, Cornwall TR10 9FE, UK

15. Department of Biology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

Corresponding author: Lindholm, A.K. ([anna.lindholm@ieu.uzh.ch](mailto:anna.lindholm@ieu.uzh.ch))

34

35    Keywords: extinction, gametogenesis, gene drive, meiosis, speciation, transmission

36    distortion

37

38

39

40 Abstract

41

42 Meiotic drivers are genetic variants that selfishly manipulate the production of gametes to  
43 increase their own rate of transmission, often to the detriment of the rest of the genome  
44 and the individual that carries them. This genomic conflict potentially occurs whenever a  
45 diploid organism produces a haploid stage, and can have profound evolutionary impacts on  
46 gametogenesis, fertility, individual behaviour, mating system, population survival, and  
47 reproductive isolation. Multiple research teams are developing artificial drive systems for  
48 pest control, utilizing the transmission advantage of drive to alter or exterminate target  
49 species. Here, we review current knowledge of how natural drive systems function, how  
50 drivers spread through natural populations, and the factors that limit their invasion.

51

## 52    **The battle for transmission**

53    One of the few rules in biology is Mendel's law of equal segregation: the two copies of each  
54    gene and/or chromosome in a diploid organism are transmitted with equal probability to its  
55    offspring. Although often taken for granted, it is increasingly clear that equal segregation is  
56    a fragile détente in a world of constant intra-genomic competition (see Glossary) for  
57    passage to the next generation. Such conflict plays out in the arenas of meiosis and  
58    gametogenesis, and results in meiotic drive [1], the biased transmission of a gene or  
59    chromosome against its alternative (Box 1). Because selection on meiotic drive elements  
60    operates at a level below that of the individual, drivers can spread through populations even  
61    if they reduce organism fitness [2]. By the same process, recently developed synthetic drive  
62    elements, which are currently still confined to laboratories, have the potential to rapidly  
63    modify genomes in wild populations [3]. Both natural and synthetic drive systems can have  
64    profound ecological, evolutionary, and genomic consequences.

## 65    ***Meiotic drive systems in nature***

66    In this review we explore the ecological and evolutionary dynamics of natural meiotic drive  
67    systems. We focus on three kinds of drive: female meiotic drive, male meiotic drive (sperm  
68    killers), and drive in haploid spores (spore killers, Box 1). However, meiotic drive can  
69    encompass a broad range of systems we do not discuss, including supernumerary B  
70    chromosomes, zygote killers and paternal genome eliminators.

71    Female meiotic drive occurs when homologous chromosomes are differentially transmitted  
72    to the egg during meiosis. In plants and animals, female meiosis is asymmetric, with only  
73    one of the four meiotic products becoming an egg or, in plants, a megagametophyte ([4],

74 Box 1). Any chromosomal variant that biases its own segregation (for example, by  
75 preferentially associating with and moving toward the egg pole at Meiosis I) will be  
76 transmitted to more than half of the maturing eggs. Although this bias does not necessarily  
77 reduce the production of eggs (as only one egg matures per meiosis), the fitness of other  
78 alleles at the same locus, that do not bias transmission, and alleles linked to them, is  
79 reduced. Such meiotic drivers could reduce the fitness of individuals that carry them, if the  
80 driving variant is genetically linked to deleterious mutations or has deleterious pleiotropic  
81 effects.

82 Male meiotic drive takes multiple forms – some at least partially meiotic, some entirely  
83 post-meiotic – but all involve a driving element that prevents maturation or function of  
84 sperm that do not contain it. Because haploid sperm within a single ejaculate compete to  
85 fertilize the same pool of eggs, disabling non-carrier sperm results in transmission of the  
86 driving element to more than half of the functional gametes and resulting offspring ([5], Box  
87 1). However, disabling non-carrier sperm often reduces fertility [6].

88 Spore drive in fungi, in which the products of meiosis are packaged together in an ascus,  
89 operates via similar mechanisms. Spores with one haploid genotype will kill or disable  
90 spores of the alternative haplotype ([7], Box 1). If spores disperse long distances sibling  
91 spores are unlikely to compete and killing them will not increase the killer's fitness.  
92 However, spore killing can be beneficial if there is local resource competition.

93 Exciting progress has been made in dissecting the genetic and cellular mechanisms of  
94 multiple drive systems that span eukaryotic diversity (Box 1). However, we are still in the  
95 early stages of understanding how these genetic systems interact with ecology to shape the  
96 dynamics of drivers in natural populations. The fate of a meiotic driver depends on the costs

of transmission bias and the mating system, environmental factors, and population and geographic structure that affect the fitness of its carriers. These interactions might then affect how drivers contribute to genetic and phenotypic variation within and among populations, potentially contributing to speciation [8]. On a larger time-scale, coevolution between drive elements and suppressors might also shape fundamental aspects of eukaryotic biology, including meiosis, gametogenesis, and genome structure [9-11]. Finally, understanding how ecology influences the population dynamics of meiotic drivers is important for predicting the success of synthetic drive elements, which are currently being engineered and applied to the management of vector populations of important human diseases ([12], Box 2 and Box 3). In this review, we consider the impacts drivers can have on the genomes, individuals and populations that harbour them, then discuss the factors that influence the dynamics of drivers in natural populations.

## **Consequences of drive**

### ***Genomic conflict***

Meiotic drivers can pose a significant cost to the rest of the genome, which is then under selection for unlinked alleles that suppress drive and restore equal segregation. Consider a driving allele that resides on an X-chromosome in a species with heterogametic (XY) males. The driving X causes Y-bearing sperm to die, such that the driving X is transmitted to all offspring, who become daughters. The spread of the driving X makes the population sex ratio increasingly female-biased, until lack of males causes population collapse and extinction [13]. It is easy to imagine that any Y-chromosome that resists drive will be favoured by selection [14], even if the driver is rare. Once the population sex ratio has become female-biased, classical Fisherian sex ratio selection will favour any autosomal



mutation that suppresses drive [13, 15]. Interestingly, a recent comparative study on tetrapods suggests that sex chromosome drive could account for the evolutionary pattern of species with male heterogamety exhibiting more female-biased adult sex ratios than species with female heterogamety [16].

Many drive systems consist of multiple drivers and suppressors, with several loci being involved with drive expression [17]. These systems suggest that the conflict does not end once a suppressor of drive has evolved. Instead, enhancers linked to the original drive locus could evolve to restore drive, resuming the conflict. In this way, a drive system can cycle through periods of apparent drive and lack of drive resembling a co-evolutionary arms race [18], resulting in a complex genetic drive system. Recurrent coevolution between drivers and suppressors can contribute to the rapid evolution of genes, satellite DNA, and pathways whose functions might otherwise be expected to be conserved.

### ***Rapid divergence in sequences, genome organisation and populations***

Drive can contribute to DNA sequence evolution via selfish, driving nucleotide substitutions. For example, the meiotic drive gene *Overdrive* (Genbank: GA19777) of the fruit-fly, *Drosophila pseudoobscura bogatana*, differs from the non-driving wildtype allele of its close relative, *D. pseudoobscura pseudoobscura*, by seven nucleotide changes [19]. More often, drive seems to involve copy number variants: the *Segregation Distorter* system of *Drosophila melanogaster* involves a partial duplication of a protein-coding gene [20]; the *t* haplotype distorter system of the house mouse (*Mus musculus*) involves four tandemly-duplicated genes [21]; copy number gain of the *R2d* distorter locus in house mice is associated with drive [22]; and the tandemly-repeated, rapidly evolving, testis-expressed ampliconic genes of mammalian sex chromosomes are thought to result from recurrent

arms races over gene dosage [23]. Such arms races do not necessarily occur between a driver and suppressors: different allelic variants of a meiotic driver can also compete against one another [24, 25]. The rapid evolution of centromeres and centromeric proteins is particularly striking because these essential proteins are otherwise expected to be highly conserved [26]. Early speculation that female meiotic drive might be responsible for this rapid centromeric change is now supported by evidence in *Mimulus* monkeyflowers [27]. Finally, testis-expressed de novo genes often arise and spread to fixation but then, once fixed, degenerate into non-functional pseudogenes—a pattern suggestive of drive [28]. The recent identification of a young, rapidly evolving heterochromatin protein gene involved in a case of X chromosome drive in *Drosophila simulans* strongly supports this idea [29].

Drive can also have large-scale impacts on genome organization and chromosome structure. Sperm killing meiotic drive elements often begin with just two loci — a driver and a target sequence, tightly linked to prevent the production of a suicide chromosome — but subsequently become elaborated via the recruitment of genetically linked enhancers. Such linked, co-adapted gene complexes are expected to evolve in regions of low recombination and can become further protected from recombination by chromosomal inversions [30]. Reduced recombination associated with male drive has been found in *Segregation Distorter* [31], the *t* haplotype [32], *Spore killer* [33] and *Drosophila recens* *Sex-Ratio* [34]. Female drive can involve dramatic changes in the quantity and sequence content of centromeric satellite DNA and proteins, as centromeres evolve to compete for access to primary oocytes and avoid relegation to the polar bodies, losing their chance for transmission (Box 1; [11, 35, 36]). Female drive can also favour the evolution of chromosome fusions or fissions, in which two fused centromeres experience a transmission rate different from that of non-fused

ones, thus fuelling karyotype evolution [4]. As drive is usually exclusive to one sex, it accentuates intralocus sexual conflict [37]. Hence a drive locus is expected to acquire genetically linked sexually antagonistic loci [38], potentially explaining the origin of sex chromosomes [39]

The combined effects of drive on DNA, genome, and karyotype evolution can lead to rapid divergence between populations and ultimately to speciation. For example, the fixation of alternative chromosome fusions in different populations can result in incompatible karyotypes that cause meiotic segregation problems in heterozygous individuals [36, 40]. Recurrent drive and suppression can lead to cryptic drive systems, where fair meiosis has been restored within a species, but in a hybrid individual the dormant or suppressed drive elements can then spring into action [5, 41, 42]. Due to reduced recombination and lack of homology, well-differentiated sex chromosomes are more susceptible to the invasion of drive elements. The recurrent fixation of cryptic drive systems on sex chromosomes might explain the prominent role of the X chromosome in the evolution of hybrid sterility in a wide range of species [42-44]. Cryptic drive systems appear to contribute to reproductive isolation between populations and species of *Drosophila* [19, 45], stalk-eyed flies [46] and yeasts [47].

#### ***Growth and persistence of populations***

Drive can also have ecological consequences. Female-biased populations are expected to have higher per capita growth rates [13, 48]. Although individuals carrying X-linked drivers might leave fewer descendants than other members of their subpopulation that lack drivers, subpopulations containing an intermediate frequency of drivers might have faster population growth relative to driver-free subpopulations [48] and competing species [49].

Finally, a significant consequence of distorted sex ratios is the potential for population extinction due to the lack of one sex [13, 50, 51], though definite evidence for such extinctions is almost entirely limited to lab populations [52-54].

## **Dynamics of drive**

### ***Stability of driver frequencies in natural populations***

All else being equal, drivers are predicted to increase in frequency due to biased transmission, and go to fixation. However, the spread of a driver can be limited by genetic suppressors, as well as fitness costs to carriers such as decreased fertility or viability [50]. Most of the known drive elements impose fitness costs on their carriers [6, 31, 55], either due to direct pleiotropic effects of the driver on survival or reproductive success, production of a biased sex ratio (in the case of sex-linked drivers), or via deleterious mutations linked to the driver. The latter are expected to build up in drive systems located in genomic regions with reduced recombination (e.g., inversions). Genetic studies suggest that some well-studied drive systems apparently have persisted for considerable time (estimated ages: *t* haplotype in mice circa 2 MYA [56], *D. pseudoobscura Sex-Ratio* circa 1 MYA [57]). This long-term stability is surprising: a drive polymorphism is characterised by powerful selection on drivers and suppressors, and simple models suggest even a small change in drive or suppression strength can potentially lead rapidly to extinction or fixation. However, well-studied drivers in stable polymorphisms may represent a biased sample, if most drivers rapidly reach fixation or extinction, thereby becoming almost impossible to detect.

Fitness costs to individuals homozygous for the drive allele might help explain the persistence of some polymorphisms [51, 58, 59]. As autosomal drivers only benefit from

transmission bias when in heterozygotes, they are most likely to be able to drive when rare. At higher frequencies, driver homozygotes become common, unmasking any recessive deleterious mutations linked to the drive allele. Processes that increase homozygote frequency, such as inbreeding, are predicted to reduce autosomal driver frequency [58]. The general prediction of an intermediate equilibrium for drivers with homozygous costs is borne out in some cases; for example, in yellow monkeyflowers, male and female fitness costs measured in the field together predict the observed frequency of a centromere-associated driver [59]. However, driver frequency in natural populations is often substantially lower than predicted by simple models based on homozygote fitness effects [17, 60].

Field studies of driver dynamics are rare, as few wild populations harbouring meiotic drivers have been repeatedly sampled [24, 54, 61, 62]. Long-term studies of driver frequencies within populations are even rarer [60]. Several species show apparently stable clines in driver frequency [54, 62], e.g. the frequencies in *Drosophila pseudoobscura* populations across North America have remained unchanged for 70 years. In contrast, a strong decline of the house mouse *t* haplotype frequency within one population was seen over six years [60]. There are also examples of rapidly spreading drivers. In *D. simulans*, a young X driver originating in Africa has spread in the Middle East within the last two decades [62] while simultaneously decreasing in East Africa due to genetic suppression. The reasons for the stability of some drive systems, and the rapid spread and decline of others, are poorly understood and a major focus of drive research.

### ***Sexual selection against driver-carrying individuals***

Male and female mating behaviour are predicted to influence driver dynamics. The costs associated with drive create a benefit to avoiding mating with individuals carrying a driver, and so preferences against driver-carriers are expected to evolve [63]. In stalk-eyed flies (*Teleopsis dalmanni*) females prefer to mate with males with larger eyespans, and driver-carrying males tend to have smaller eyespans [64, 65]. In some house mouse populations, females carrying the *t* haplotype discriminate against driver males in choice tests, though wildtype females show no preference [66, 67]. However, as recombination is expected to break linkage between drive elements and traits that allow mate choice [63], with undetectable drivers predicted to rapidly outcompete detectable forms, premating discrimination against driver males might be uncommon [6]. Alternatively, as many sperm killers significantly reduce sperm numbers, females could potentially avoid drivers by preferentially discarding sperm from males transferring small ejaculates, as hinted by a study in *D. simulans* [68]. The production of driver-carrying progeny can also be avoided through sperm competition when females mate with multiple males, assuming driver-carrying males are poor sperm competitors [69]. Both theoretical models [51, 60, 70] and empirical studies [54, 55, 61, 71-73] support the idea that gamete competition can reduce driver frequencies and limit the spread of male drivers under some conditions (see [51]). Indeed, the presence of drive elements can select for and lead to an increase in female mating frequency. If female mating rates are density dependent [73], this could make drivers rare in denser populations.

### ***Spatial heterogeneity***

Driver distribution varies across space and between habitats, and this aspect of natural drive systems might be important for the successful application of artificial drivers (see Box 2 and

Box 3). Drivers in mice and monkeyflowers vary in abundance between populations [59, 74]. *Segregation Distorter* is typically found at very low frequencies in *D. melanogaster* [31], while two other *Drosophila* species show latitudinal clines in driver frequency across North America [54, 61]. Driver frequency correlates negatively with the frequency of polyandry in these populations, supporting the hypothesis that polyandry impacts the success of drivers in nature. However, in *D. neotestacea*, the environmental factor that best predicts the frequency of drivers is winter temperature [75], implying that drivers might be limited by elevated susceptibility to cold in driver carriers. Frequency of drivers in *D. pseudoobscura* can cycle yearly [76], suggesting more complex ecological interactions control driver abundance. Sperm killers can interact with other environmental factors that affect male fertility, such as high temperature [77]. It seems that variation in driver fitness between populations can result from interactions between environmental factors and the characteristics of populations harbouring drivers, potentially including differences between populations in deleterious genes linked to drive elements.

### **Fixation and extinction of drivers**

Stable drive systems might be the exception, not the rule, with most drivers rapidly reaching fixation or extinction and becoming undetectable [50]. Population extinction is frequently predicted by simple models of sex chromosome drive [13, 50, 51]. It is difficult to measure the frequency of drive-mediated extinction because extinct populations leave no trace: while sampling wild *D. neotestacea*, Pinzone and Dyer [54] collected 175 flies from an isolated population, 91% of which were female; the following year only three flies were found at the same site, all driver-carrying females, and only one was inseminated. Laboratory experiments suggest that local extinctions are likely [52, 53]. Local extinctions

280 might allow drive to persist in a spatial mosaic where drive-related local extinctions are  
281 followed by rapid recolonisation from nearby sites [78]. Finding definitive evidence for such  
282 processes is very difficult, and the frequency at which such extinctions occur cannot  
283 typically be gauged.

284 Autosomal male meiotic drivers, as well as chromosomal variants driving through female  
285 meiosis, might often fix without causing extinction. Thus models predict a large number of  
286 cryptic drive systems, that could potentially be revealed by crosses between populations  
287 (see Box 4). However, population studies of autosomal drivers are so rare that the evidence  
288 is extremely limited. Moreover, the best studied autosomal sperm killing meiotic driver [31]  
289 and female meiotic drivers [59] are polymorphic within species, not fixed. Consequently we  
290 do not know how common autosomal and female drive systems are, nor how often they  
291 reach fixation.

#### 292 ***Poorly understood dynamics in many systems***

293 The ecological dynamics of spore killers in fungi are little known. Although the system is  
294 increasingly understood at the genetic level [32, 77], the rarity of local resource competition  
295 makes the advantage they gain from drive obscure [78]. Ecological understanding of the  
296 dynamics of female drivers is also poor, with the exception of *Mimulus* monkeyflowers [59].  
297 Finally, some documented sperm killer systems are more complex than any existing  
298 theoretical models. For example, *Drosophila paramelanica* has two driving X chromosomes,  
299 a Y that is susceptible to both, another Y that is resistant to one of the drivers, and  
300 latitudinal differences between populations in the co-occurrence of drivers and Y  
301 chromosomes [79]. Currently, little is known about how multiple drivers and resistance  
302 chromosomes coexist. Understanding factors that influence natural drive system dynamics



303 is likely to be important to ensure the successful application of synthetic drive systems (see  
304 Box 2 and Box 3).

### 305 **Summary and conclusions**

306 The potential for meiotic drive is probably high in all sexual organisms with a diploid phase,  
307 because the conflict over the transmission of homologous chromosomes in haploid gametes  
308 is nearly universal. Our understanding of the ecological and evolutionary dynamics of drive  
309 is surprisingly poor, even in well-studied systems. Nevertheless, some consistent themes  
310 stand out. Genetic suppression can evolve to neutralize drivers to the extent that the driver  
311 becomes undetectable, and this suppression can evolve and spread extremely rapidly [62].  
312 Yet suppression is not universal, and some ancient systems seem to have never evolved  
313 resistance or suppression. All well-studied extant drivers have costs, either intrinsic to the  
314 mechanism they use to gain their transmission advantage, or resulting from the reduced  
315 recombination that commonly associates with drive. Repeated discoveries of such  
316 associations suggest that extant drive systems are often complex, using multiple genes,  
317 perhaps indicating that successful drivers need modifiers that help them avoid suppression.  
318 Active drive systems vary in frequency between populations, and sometimes over seasons  
319 and years, suggesting that the fitness of drivers depends on their local environmental  
320 conditions, in ways that are currently not well understood.

321 Novel synthetic drive techniques (see Box 2) have the potential to fundamentally alter  
322 natural populations in ways analogous to meiotic drive. These synthetic drive systems have  
323 enormous potential for biocontrol, but if they are used without understanding how drive  
324 behaves in natural systems, there are serious risks of synthetic drive both failing to achieve  
325 its aims and having unintended negative consequences. Work on natural drive systems

326 shows that the consequences of drive are manifold, from speciation to genome  
327 organisation, gametogenesis, competition between species, mate choice and mating  
328 systems. Once synthetic drivers are released into nature, the potential for long-term  
329 evolutionary changes in the target species and its community are profound.

330 New natural drive systems will be discovered in coming years (see Box 4), e.g. by the  
331 discovery of non-Mendelian patterns of inheritance in sequence data. Detecting new drivers  
332 should help answer many of the outstanding questions in the field (Box 5), and without  
333 doubt will uncover new mechanisms of drive, as well as unexpected genomic consequences  
334 of drive.

### 335 **Acknowledgements**

336 This review was written at the Ecology of Meiotic Drive workshop, with funding from the  
337 SNSF (IZ32Z0\_160288), the Russian Science Foundation (15-29-02550), the Department of  
338 Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies (University of Zurich), and the VAUZ.

339

## Box 1. Definition, mechanisms and species

Meiotic drive occurs when alleles, haplotypes, or chromosomes subvert mechanisms of fair segregation to obtain greater than Mendelian transmission at the expense of homologues. Sandler & Novitski [1] first used the term “meiotic drive” to describe biased transmission that results as “a consequence of the mechanics of the meiotic divisions”. For instance, in taxa with asymmetric female meiosis, structural elements of chromosomes— *e.g.*, centromeres, telomeres and heterochromatic neo-centromeres (“knobs”)— can compete for inclusion in the gamete and hence transmission to subsequent generations, with failing chromosomes discarded into the polar bodies. Examples of drive through female meiosis have been observed in mice [22, 36], maize [80], and monkeyflowers ([35], Figure 1A). However, “meiotic drive” is often used in a broader sense to include biased transmission resulting from a variety of premeiotic, meiotic and postmeiotic events during gametogenesis [17]. In males, for instance, drive elements can achieve biased transmission by killing sperm that lack the element (Figure 1B). These gametic drivers typically involve a drive locus and a target locus. They can occur on autosomes— as in the mouse *t* haplotype [56] and the fruitfly *Segregation Distorter* [31]— or on sex chromosomes, causing distorted sex ratios among progeny— as in *Silene* flowering plants [81], stalk-eyed flies [82], mosquitoes [17], and many *Drosophila* species [17]. Finally, in fungi a heterozygous cross between strains carrying a spore killer allele and a sensitive allele results in elimination of haploid ascospores that lack the spore killer allele ([7], Figure 1C). Spore killer genetics can involve a single locus [83], or be complex, involving multiple loci [33]. Even this brief summary highlights that selfish drive elements gain transmission advantages through diverse genetic mechanisms across the eukaryotes.

363     FIGURE 1 HERE

364

## Box 2. Synthetic drive

Disease-transmitting insects impose a massive burden on human populations. There are an estimated 198 million cases of malaria each year, resulting in 580 thousand deaths, and 390 million people infected with dengue. Control of insect vectors using pesticides is expensive and can damage both ecosystems and people [84]. There is an urgent need for inexpensive, targeted pest control techniques. In recent years, researchers have turned to genetic engineering tools to control vectors of human disease with one of two goals: 1) to modify target populations to carry anti-pathogen genes that limit their capacity to spread disease, and 2) to reduce or collapse target population sizes [13, 85]. Various drive systems can be exploited to create synthetic drive systems (also known as gene drive) that can quickly spread through populations [85]. Transposable elements, homing endonucleases, *Medea* elements, *Wolbachia*, CRISPR-Cas9, as well as meiotic drivers each have potential use in synthetic drive methods to modify or collapse disease vector populations [1, 53, 85-87].

Several groups have engineered synthetic drive systems in mosquitoes [88] and *Drosophila* [87, 89, 90]. Extreme sex ratio distortion offers one method of population extermination [13, 53]. Galizi *et al.* [88] recently developed a homing endonuclease-based synthetic drive system capable of eliminating experimental populations of *Anopheles gambiae* mosquitoes (Box Figure 2) within six generations by targeting X chromosomes during meiosis.

Alternative strategies for population modification or collapse involve synthetic toxin-antidote systems [85, 87, 91]. Many of these systems are modelled after *Medea*, a female gamete killing driver originally discovered in *Tribolium castaneum* that kills embryos that fail to inherit the element [87, 91].

387 Homing endonucleases have been used to create an artificial sperm killing meiotic drive  
388 system [85, 88]. The new CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing technology targets specific sites in  
389 the genome and could prove to be a powerful source of synthetic drive systems, even in  
390 non-model pest species [86].

391 Synthetic drive systems have applications far beyond insect population control [92],  
392 including in agriculture [93], controlling invasive species and pests, or even conservation  
393 [92]. We discuss the significant challenges and risks involved in the release of any such drive  
394 system in Box 3.

395

396 FIGURE 2 HERE

397

### **Box 3. Synthetic drive: Lessons from natural drive systems**

Genetic engineering of synthetic drive systems (Box 2) for release in natural populations has provoked controversy. If a synthetic driver spreads successfully, will it spread to non-target populations or species? Will the drive mechanism interfere with key molecular pathways, resulting in unexpected phenotypic changes? Progress toward a synthetic drive system in a target disease vector has been slow owing to challenges in genetic engineering in non-model organisms. However, genome editing using the CRISPR-Cas9 system has the potential to rapidly accelerate the field. Several groups have suggested policy or protocols for releasing drive systems, but with these recent advances, additional discussion and regulation is urgently needed [12, 92, 94, 95]. Below we outline several key challenges and concerns.

1. Adverse effects of synthetic drive: Before a synthetic drive system can be used in a natural population, extensive testing for unintended consequences and side effects (*e.g.* it does not transmit other pathogens, lead to higher bite rates from insect disease vectors, or have unanticipated effects on local ecology) is needed. Adverse phenotypic effects might be ameliorated by introducing another driver to reverse the effects of the initial driver [92, 95].
2. Risk of cross-contamination: This risk is presumably low for homing endonuclease genes [85] or CRISPR-Cas9-based drive systems or other site-specific synthetic drivers, and could be reduced further by targeting specific sites limited to the intended species [92].

3. Suppressors: Any drive system must spread rapidly enough to be relevant to human disease, and before the system has time to evolve suppressors [85]. Multiple drivers with multiple targets is one possible solution to combat suppression [85].

4. Environmental heterogeneity: many natural drive systems show patchy or clinal distributions, indicating that costs of drivers vary between locations. Even strong synthetic drivers might be unable to penetrate all areas a target inhabits, potentially leaving reservoirs where suppression can evolve.

The parallels between synthetic and natural drivers make it likely that synthetic drive can be usefully informed by understanding the function and regulation of natural drive systems. In particular, suppressors are common in natural drive systems and can evolve rapidly [62]. Modified natural drive systems in both *Drosophila* [53] and mosquito species [96] faced difficulties from the rapid response of segregating suppressors in the population.



#### 433 **Box 4 Discovering drive**

434 **Initial detection** -- Meiotic drive, both apparent and cryptic, affects patterns of phenotypic,  
435 genetic, and genomic variation. Although these patterns are generally not exclusive to drive,  
436 and thus are not definitive signatures, they provide valuable clues that drive might be  
437 present in a population or species. Polymorphic spore killer and sex-chromosome sperm  
438 killer systems might even be detectable in natural populations, as they visibly affect spores  
439 within an ascus and sex ratios in progeny, respectively. Similarly, high genetic variance in  
440 fertility that is incompatible with mutation-selection balance models might suggest the  
441 presence of either autosomal sperm killers or costs associated with other balanced drive  
442 polymorphisms [97]. All forms of drive discussed here could be revealed as genetically-  
443 localized transmission ratio distortion (TRD) in mapping populations or pedigrees, and, with  
444 sufficient sample sizes, gametic distortion might be statistically distinguishable from post-  
445 zygotic (non-drive) distortion mechanisms [98]. Indeed, cryptic drive systems, in which a  
446 driver and suppressor have both gone to local fixation, are primarily detectable as aberrant  
447 phenomena (sterility, sex ratio, TRD, chromosomal abnormalities) in experimental hybrids  
448 between distinct populations or species. As genomic scans of variation become increasingly  
449 common, there will also undoubtedly be cases where selective sweeps or balanced  
450 inversion polymorphisms reflect natural selection via meiotic drive rather than via individual  
451 fitness [99].

452 **Validation** -- Of course, none of these possible indications of meiotic drive are exclusively  
453 (or even most plausibly) explained by drive rather than other processes. Thus, the  
454 characterization of new drive systems ideally includes both exclusion of alternative  
455 processes that can generate TRD, infertility, or other suggestive phenomena, and positive

456 validation of a given drive mechanism. Validation can be quite difficult for some systems  
457 and forms of drive, but is relatively accessible in others. New genomic technologies are likely  
458 to accelerate both validation and detection of drive. For example, deep-sequencing of  
459 pooled sperm of F1 hybrids can directly determine gamete frequency prior to the  
460 confounding effects of fertilization, and thus holds great promise as a tool for the detection  
461 and validation of autosomal sperm killer systems [100]. Broad application of such  
462 approaches will be the key to addressing general questions about the relative frequency of  
463 different kinds of drive in nature.

464

465

466 **Glossary**

467 **Ascus:** The sexual cell in fungi that undergoes meiosis to produce spores, typically eight

468 **Autosomal drivers:** Transmission distorters located on autosomal chromosomes

469 **Centromere:** The part of the chromosome attached to the spindle during cell division that  
470 allows chromosomes to separate during meiosis

471 **CRISPR-Cas9:** A genome editing technique involving a Cas9 nuclease, originally isolated from  
472 bacteria, that cuts target sites in the genome specified by complementary guide RNAs.

473 **Drive suppressors:** Factors that reduce the transmission rate of a driver

474 **Enhancers:** Genes that increase the transmission rate of a driver

475 **Female meiotic drive:** Biased transmission that arises during asymmetric female meiosis

476 **Fisherian sex ratio selection:** Theory predicting 1:1 male:female sex ratios because the  
477 fitness of the rarer sex is higher, all else being equal

478 **Homing endonuclease genes:** Transmission distorters that insert themselves onto the  
479 homologous chromosome during DNA repair, converting a heterozygote into a homozygote  
480 for the element

481 **Intra-genomic competition and conflict:** The conflict between elements of the genome  
482 when the action of one reduces the transmission of the other, encompassing meiotic drive,  
483 selfish endosymbionts, transposable elements, homing-endonucleases and many others.

484 **Karyotype:** The number and large-scale structure of chromosomes of an individual

485 **Male meiotic drive:** Biased transmission that arises during male gamete production

486 **Meiotic drive:** Allelic variants that manipulate gamete production to ensure they are  
 487 transmitted to more than a fair Mendelian proportion of gametes

488 **Polyandry:** Female mating with multiple males

489 **Post-zygotic (non-drive) distortion mechanisms:** Selection on zygotes, for example the  
 490 natural death of low fitness zygotes

491 **Segregation Distorter:** An autosomal male driver in *Drosophila melanogaster* that kills  
 492 sperm that do not carry a copy of it

493 **Segregation distortion:** Biased transmission to the next generation by the selfish action of a  
 494 genetic element

495 **X (or Y)-linked driver:** Meiotic drive system located on a sex chromosome

496 **Sperm killer:** A male meiotic driver that impairs development of sperm that do not carry it

497 **Spore killer:** A meiotic driver in fungi that kills spores that do not carry a copy of it

498 **Synthetic drive systems:** Drivers that have been artificially engineered in the laboratory

499 **Target sequence:** Specific DNA sequence that is acted upon by another factor such as a  
 500 driver or nuclease

501 **t haplotype distorter:** an autosomal driver acting in the house mouse male that harms  
 502 sperm that do not carry a copy of it

503 **Telomere:** A region of repetitive DNA that caps the ends of chromosomes

504

505

## 506    **References**

- 507    1.     Sandler, L. and Novitski, E. (1957) Meiotic drive as an evolutionary force. *Am. Nat.*  
508            91, 105-110
- 509    2.     Haldane, J.B.S. (1932) *The Causes of Evolution*. Longmans, Green and Co.
- 510    3.     Bull, J.J. (2015) Evolutionary decay and the prospects for long-term disease  
511            intervention using engineered insect vectors. *Evol. Med. Public Health* 2015, 152-166
- 512    4.     Pardo-Manuel De Villena, F. and Sapienza, C. (2001) Nonrandom segregation during  
513            meiosis: the unfairness of females. *Mamm. Genome* 12, 331-339
- 514    5.     Presgraves, D. (2009) Drive and sperm: the evolution and genetics of male meiotic  
515            drive. In *Sperm Biology: An Evolutionary Perspective* (Birkhead, T.R., *et al.*, eds),  
516            Elsevier
- 517    6.     Price, T.A.R. and Wedell, N. (2008) Selfish genetic elements and sexual selection:  
518            their impact on male fertility. *Genetica* 134, 99-111
- 519    7.     Raju, N.B. (1994) Ascomycete spore killers: chromosomal elements that distort  
520            genetic ratios among the products of meiosis. *Mycologia* 86, 461-473
- 521    8.     Crespi, B. and Nosil, P. (2013) Conflictual speciation: species formation via genomic  
522            conflict. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 28, 48-57
- 523    9.     Hurst, G.D.D. and Werren, J.H. (2001) The role of selfish genetic elements in  
524            eukaryotic evolution. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 2, 597-606
- 525    10.    Rice, W.R. (2013) Nothing in genetics makes sense except in light of genomic conflict.  
526            *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 44, 217-237
- 527    11.    Henikoff, S., *et al.* (2001) The centromere paradox: stable inheritance with rapidly  
528            evolving DNA. *Science* 293, 1098-1102
- 529    12.    Oye, K.A., *et al.* (2014) Regulating gene drives. *Science* 345, 626-628

- 530 13. Hamilton, W. (1967) Extraordinary sex ratios. *Science* 156, 477-488
- 531 14. Unckless, R.L., *et al.* (2015) Sex-Ratio meiotic drive and Y-linked resistance in  
532 *Drosophila affinis*. *Genetics* 199, 831-840
- 533 15. Fisher, R.A. (1930) *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*. The Clarendon Press
- 534 16. Pipoly, I., *et al.* (2015) The genetic sex-determination system predicts adult sex ratios  
535 in tetrapods. *Nature* 527, 91-94
- 536 17. Jaenike, J. (2001) Sex chromosome meiotic drive. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 32, 25-  
537 49
- 538 18. Hall, D.W. (2004) Meiotic drive and sex chromosome cycling. *Evolution* 58, 925-931
- 539 19. Phadnis, N. and Orr, H.A. (2009) A single gene causes both male sterility and  
540 segregation distortion in *Drosophila* hybrids. *Science* 323, 376-379
- 541 20. Merrill, C., *et al.* (1999) Truncated RanGAP encoded by the *Segregation Distorter*  
542 locus of *Drosophila*. *Science* 283, 1742-1745
- 543 21. Bauer, H., *et al.* (2005) The *t*-complex-encoded GTPase-activating protein Tagap1  
544 acts as a transmission ratio distorter in mice. *Nat. Genet.* 37, 969-973
- 545 22. Didion, J.P., *et al.* (2015) A multi-megabase copy number gain causes maternal  
546 transmission ratio distortion on mouse chromosome 2. *PLoS Genet.* 11, e1004850
- 547 23. Nam, K., *et al.* (2015) Extreme selective sweeps independently targeted the X  
548 chromosomes of the great apes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 112, 6413-6418
- 549 24. Brand, C.L., *et al.* (2015) Origin, evolution, and population genetics of the selfish  
550 *Segregation Distorter* gene duplication in European and African populations of  
551 *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* 69, 1271-1283
- 552 25. van Boven, M. and Weissing, F.J. (2001) Competition at the mouse *t* complex: rare  
553 alleles are inherently favored. *Theor. Popul. Biol.* 60, 343-358

- 554 26. Malik, H.S. and Henikoff, S. (2009) Major evolutionary transitions in centromere  
555 complexity. *Cell* 138, 1067-1082
- 556 27. Finseth, F.R., *et al.* (2015) Duplication and adaptive evolution of a key centromeric  
557 protein in *Mimulus*, a genus with female meiotic drive. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 32, 2694-2706
- 558 28. Bai, Y., *et al.* (2007) Comparative genomics reveals a constant rate of origination and  
559 convergent acquisition of functional retrogenes in *Drosophila*. *Genome Biol.* 8, R11
- 560 29. Helleu, Q., *et al.* (in revision) Rapid evolution of a Y-chromosome heterochromatin  
561 protein underlies sex chromosome meiotic drive. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*
- 562 30. Charlesworth, B. and Hartl, D.L. (1978) Population dynamics of the *Segregation*  
563 *Distorter* polymorphism of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 89, 171-192
- 564 31. Larracunte, A.M. and Presgraves, D.C. (2012) The selfish *Segregation Distorter* gene  
565 complex of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 192, 33-53
- 566 32. Justice, M.J. and Bode, V.C. (1988) Genetic analysis of mouse *t* haplotypes using  
567 mutations induced by ethylnitrosourea mutagenesis: the order of *T* and *qk* is  
568 inverted in *t* mutants. *Genetics* 120, 533-543
- 569 33. Harvey, A.M., *et al.* (2014) A critical component of meiotic drive in *Neurospora* is  
570 located near a chromosome rearrangement. *Genetics* 197, 1165-1174
- 571 34. Dyer, K.A., *et al.* (2007) Chromosome-wide linkage disequilibrium as a consequence  
572 of meiotic drive. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 104, 1587-1592
- 573 35. Fishman, L. and Saunders, A. (2008) Centromere-associated female meiotic drive  
574 entails male fitness costs in monkeyflowers. *Science* 322, 1559-1562
- 575 36. Chmátal, L., *et al.* (2014) Centromere strength provides the cell biological basis for  
576 meiotic drive and karyotype evolution in mice. *Curr. Biol.* 24, 2295-2300

- 577 37. Manser, A., *et al.* (2012) The effect of polyandry on a distorter system with  
578 differential viabilities in the sexes. *Commun. Integr. Biol.* 5, 550-552
- 579 38. Patten, M.M. (2014) Meiotic drive influences the outcome of sexually antagonistic  
580 selection at a linked locus. *J. Evol. Biol.* 27, 2360-2370
- 581 39. Kozielska, M., *et al.* (2010) Segregation distortion and the evolution of sex-  
582 determining mechanisms. *Heredity* 104, 100-112
- 583 40. Baker, R.J. and Bickham, J.W. (1986) Speciation by monobrachial centric fusions.  
584 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 83, 8245-8248
- 585 41. Frank, S.A. (1991) Divergence of meiotic drive-suppression systems as an explanation  
586 for sex- biased hybrid sterility and inviability. *Evolution* 45, 262-267
- 587 42. Hurst, L.D. and Pomiankowski, A. (1991) Causes of sex ratio bias may account for  
588 unisexual sterility in hybrids: a new explanation of Haldane's rule and related  
589 phenomena. *Genetics* 128, 841-858
- 590 43. Presgraves, D.C. (2010) The molecular evolutionary basis of species formation. *Nat.*  
591 *Rev. Genet.* 11, 175-180
- 592 44. Meiklejohn, C.D. and Tao, Y. (2010) Genetic conflict and sex chromosome evolution.  
593 *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 25, 215-223
- 594 45. Zhang, L., *et al.* (2015) Sex ratio meiotic drive as a plausible evolutionary mechanism  
595 for hybrid male sterility. *PLoS Genet.* 11, e1005073
- 596 46. Wilkinson, G.S., *et al.* (2014) Haldane's Rule is linked to extraordinary sex ratios and  
597 sperm length in stalk-eyed flies. *Genetics* 198, 1167-1181
- 598 47. Zanders, S.E., *et al.* (2014) Genome rearrangements and pervasive meiotic drive  
599 cause hybrid infertility in fission yeast. *eLife* 3, e02630



- 600 48. Policansky, D. (1974) "Sex Ratio," meiotic drive, and group selection in *Drosophila*  
601 *pseudoobscura*. *Am. Nat.* 108, 75-90
- 602 49. Unckless, R.L. and Clark, A.G. (2014) Sex-ratio meiotic drive and interspecific  
603 competition. *J. Evol. Biol.* 27, 1513-1521
- 604 50. Carvalho, A.B. and Vaz, S.C. (1999) Are *Drosophila* SR drive chromosomes always  
605 balanced? *Heredity* 83, 221-228
- 606 51. Holman, L., *et al.* (2015) Coevolutionary dynamics of polyandry and sex-linked  
607 meiotic drive. *Evolution* 69, 709-720
- 608 52. Price, T.A.R., *et al.* (2010) Polyandry prevents extinction. *Curr. Biol.* 20, 1-5
- 609 53. Lyttle, T.W. (1977) Experimental population genetics of meiotic drive systems I.  
610 Pseudo-Y chromosomal drive as a means of eliminating cage populations of  
611 *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 86, 413-445
- 612 54. Pinzone, C.A. and Dyer, K.A. (2013) Association of polyandry and *sex-ratio* drive  
613 prevalence in natural populations of *Drosophila neotestacea*. *Proc. R. Soc. London*  
614 *Ser. B-Biol. Sci.* 280, 2013.1397
- 615 55. Sutter, A. and Lindholm, A.K. (2015) Detrimental effects of an autosomal selfish  
616 genetic element on sperm competitiveness in house mice. *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser.*  
617 *B-Biol. Sci.* 282, 2015.0974
- 618 56. Silver, L.M. (1993) The peculiar journey of a selfish chromosome: mouse *t* haplotypes  
619 and meiotic drive. *Trends Genet.* 9, 250 - 254
- 620 57. Kovacevic, M. and Schaeffer, S.W. (2000) Molecular population genetics of X-Linked  
621 genes in *Drosophila pseudoobscura*. *Genetics* 156, 155-172
- 622 58. Lewontin, R.C. and Dunn, L.C. (1960) The evolutionary dynamics of a polymorphism  
623 in the house mouse. *Genetics* 45, 705-722

59. Fishman, L. and Kelly, J.K. (2015) Centromere-associated meiotic drive and female fitness variation in *Mimulus*. *Evolution* 69, 1208-1218
60. Manser, A., et al. (2011) Polyandry and the decrease of a selfish genetic element in a wild house mouse population. *Evolution* 65, 2435-2447
61. Price, T.A.R., et al. (2014) Does polyandry control population sex ratio via regulation of a selfish gene? *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. B-Biol. Sci.* 281, 2013.3259
62. Bastide, H., et al. (2013) Local dynamics of a fast-evolving sex-ratio system in *Drosophila simulans*. *Mol. Ecol.* 22, 5352-5367
63. Lande, R. and Wilkinson, G.S. (1999) Models of sex-ratio meiotic drive and sexual selection in stalk-eyed flies. *Genet. Res.* 74, 245-253
64. Johns, P.M., et al. (2005) Genetic linkage between a sexually selected trait and X chromosome meiotic drive. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. B-Biol. Sci.* 272, 2097-2103
65. Cotton, A.J., et al. (2014) Male eyespan size is associated with meiotic drive in wild stalk-eyed flies (*Teleopsis dalmanni*). *Heredity* 112, 363-369
66. Lenington, S., et al. (1994) Female preference and variability among *t*-haplotypes in wild house mice. *Am. Nat.* 143, 766-784
67. Manser, A., et al. (2015) Female house mice avoid fertilization by *t* haplotype incompatible males in a mate choice experiment. *J. Evol. Biol.* 28, 54-64
68. Angelard, C., et al. (2008) Female-driven mechanisms, ejaculate size and quality contribute to the lower fertility of *sex-ratio* distorter males in *Drosophila simulans*. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 8, 326
69. Haig, D. and Bergstrom, C.T. (1995) Multiple mating, sperm competition and meiotic drive. *J. Evol. Biol.* 8, 265-282

- 647 70. Taylor, J.E. and Jaenike, J. (2002) Sperm competition and the dynamics of X  
648 chromosome drive: stability and extinction. *Genetics* 160, 1721-1731
- 649 71. Price, T.A.R., *et al.* (2008) Sex ratio distorter reduces sperm competitive ability in an  
650 insect. *Evolution* 62, 1644-1652
- 651 72. Wilkinson, G.S. and Fry, C.L. (2001) Meiotic drive alters sperm competitive ability in  
652 stalk-eyed flies. *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. B-Biol. Sci.* 268, 2559-2564
- 653 73. Atlan, A., *et al.* (2004) Sex-ratio distorter of *Drosophila simulans* reduces male  
654 productivity and sperm competition ability. *J. Evol. Biol.* 17, 744-751
- 655 74. Safronova, L., *et al.* (2010) The expression of transmission ratio distortion (TRD) and  
656 the frequency of carriers of t haplotypes in natural populations of house mice *Mus*  
657 *musculus*. *Russ. J. Genet.* 46, 578-585
- 658 75. Dyer, K.A. (2012) Local selection underlies the geographic distribution of sex-ratio  
659 drive in *Drosophila neotestacea*. *Evolution* 66, 973-984
- 660 76. Bryant, S.H., *et al.* (1982) "Sex-ratio" trait, sex composition, and relative abundance  
661 in *Drosophila pseudoobscura*. *Evolution* 36, 27-34
- 662 77. Price, T.A.R., *et al.* (2012) No evidence that temperature-related fertility differences  
663 influence the distribution of a selfish genetic element. *Funct. Ecol.* 26, 657-665
- 664 78. van Boven, M. and Weissing, F.J. (1999) Segregation distortion in a deme-structured  
665 population: Opposing demands of gene, individual, and group selection. *J. Evol. Biol.*  
666 12, 80-93
- 667 79. Stalker, H.D. (1961) The genetic systems modifying meiotic drive in *Drosophila*  
668 *paramelanica*. *Genetics* 46, 177-202
- 669 80. Buckler, E.S., *et al.* (1999) Meiotic drive of chromosomal knobs reshaped the maize  
670 genome. *Genetics* 153, 415-426

- 671 81. Taylor, D.R. (1994) The genetic basis of sex ratio in *Silene alba* (= *S. latifolia*). *Genetics*  
672 136, 641-651
- 673 82. Presgraves, D.C., *et al.* (1997) Sex chromosome meiotic drive in stalk-eyed flies.  
674 *Genetics* 147, 1169-1180
- 675 83. Grognet, P., *et al.* (2014) Genes that bias Mendelian segregation. *PLoS Genet.* 10,  
676 e1004387
- 677 84. Pimentel, D. and Burgess, M. (2014) Environmental and economic costs of the  
678 application of pesticides primarily in the United States. In *Integrated Pest*  
679 *Management. Pesticide Problems* (Pimentel, D. and Peshin, R., eds), pp. 47-71,  
680 Springer
- 681 85. Burt, A. (2014) Heritable strategies for controlling insect vectors of disease. *Phil.*  
682 *Trans. R. Soc. B-Biol. Sci.* 369, 2013.0432
- 683 86. Gantz, V.M., *et al.* (2015) Highly efficient Cas9-mediated gene drive for population  
684 modification of the malaria vector mosquito *Anopheles stephensi*. *Proc. Natl. Acad.*  
685 *Sci. U. S. A.* 112, E6736–E6743
- 686 87. Chen, C.-H., *et al.* (2007) A synthetic maternal-effect selfish genetic element drives  
687 population replacement in *Drosophila*. *Science* 316, 597-600
- 688 88. Galizi, R., *et al.* (2014) A synthetic sex ratio distortion system for the control of the  
689 human malaria mosquito. *Nat. Commun.* 5, 4977
- 690 89. Chan, Y.S., *et al.* (2011) Insect population control by homing endonuclease-based  
691 gene drive: an evaluation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 188, 33-44
- 692 90. Simoni, A., *et al.* (2014) Development of synthetic selfish elements based on modular  
693 nucleases in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Nuc. Acids Res.* 42, 7461-7472

- 694 91. Hay, B.A., *et al.* (2010) Engineering the genomes of wild insect populations:  
695 challenges, and opportunities provided by synthetic *Medea* selfish genetic elements.  
696 *J. Insect Physiol.* 56, 1402-1413
- 697 92. Esvelt, K.M., *et al.* (2014) Concerning RNA-guided gene drives for the alteration of  
698 wild populations. *eLife*, 03401
- 699 93. Houben, A., *et al.* (2008) Engineered plant minichromosomes: a bottom-up success?  
700 *Plant Cell* 20, 8-10
- 701 94. Akbari, O.S., *et al.* (2015) Safeguarding gene drive experiments in the laboratory.  
702 *Science* 349, 927-929
- 703 95. DiCarlo, J.E., *et al.* (2015) Safeguarding CRISPR-Cas9 gene drives in yeast. *Nat.*  
704 *Biotechnol.* 33, 1250-1255
- 705 96. Hickey, W.A. and Craig, G.B., Jr. (1966) Distortion of sex ratio in populations of *Aedes*  
706 *aegypti*. *Can. J. Genet. Cytol.* 8, 260-278
- 707 97. Scoville, A., *et al.* (2009) Contribution of chromosomal polymorphisms to the G-  
708 matrix of *Mimulus guttatus*. *New Phytol.* 183, 803-815
- 709 98. Knief, U., *et al.* (2015) A prezygotic transmission distorter acting equally in female  
710 and male zebra finches *Taeniopygia guttata*. *Mol. Ecol.* 24, 3846-3859
- 711 99. Garrigan, D., *et al.* (2014) Genome diversity and divergence in *Drosophila*  
712 *mauritiana*: multiple signatures of faster X evolution. *Genome Biol. Evol.* 6, 2444-  
713 2458
- 714 100. Corbett-Detig, R., *et al.* (2015) Direct gamete sequencing reveals no evidence for  
715 segregation distortion in house mouse hybrids. *PLoS ONE* 10, e0131933

716

717

718

719 **Figure Legends**

720 **Figure 1.** Meiotic drive. The first column shows schematics of three types of meiotic drive,  
721 with the second column showing a species that carries that drive system. (A) Female  
722 gametogenesis: driving chromosomes relegate rival chromosomes to the polar bodies. The  
723 polar bodies are lost, while the drive chromosome enters the egg. (B) Female drive occurs in  
724 monkeyflowers (C) Male gametogenesis: driving chromosomes (“D”) cause sperm that carry  
725 the rival chromosome (“d”) to die. (D) Sperm-killing segregation distortion in stalk-eyed  
726 flies. (E) Fungal spore production. Similar to male drivers, spore killers cause the death of  
727 spores that carry rival chromosomes. (F) A spore-killing system found in *Neurospora* fungi.  
728 Images: (B) Lila Fishman (D) Gerald Wilkinson (F) Hanna Johannesson

729

730 **Figure 2.** *Anopheles gambiae* female. This is the primary species responsible for the  
731 transmission of *Plasmodium falciparum*—the parasite that causes malaria—to humans.

732

## **Box. 5 Outstanding questions**

Despite involving key processes of life, our understanding of meiotic drive remains rudimentary. Here we outline some key unresolved questions.

### ***How common is drive?***

Drive is the result of a fundamental conflict and potentially occurs in any diploid organism. Yet known drivers come from a limited range of species. Is it simply that drivers are rare? If so, why? Or do drivers usually persist for a very short time before reaching fixation or going extinct? Alternatively, are some taxa particularly susceptible to drive? Indeed, we have little understanding of how often novel mutations create drive. Why are so many of the detected drivers so strong, when theory suggests weak drive should be common? Is it simply that weak drive is difficult to detect?

### ***Drivers across space and time***

Despite decades of research, we lack data on how drivers varies across time and space. Consequently, we do not know if drive is stable or cycles. We also do not know if drivers require a metapopulation for survival, nor what limits the spread of drivers between populations. Moreover, do drivers spread between hybridizing species?

### ***Molecular mechanisms of drive***

We understand the genetic basis of very few drive systems. Are there general themes in the mechanisms? Do all gametic drive systems target similar pathways, or is each unique? Is the preponderance of drive systems in the Diptera (flies) due to some shared weakness in spermatogenesis that drive can exploit? Why is genetic suppression apparently absent in



some ancient drive systems? Do these drive systems target something fundamental that cannot be defended, or are these drivers simply evolving faster than their targets?

### ***Contrasting synthetic and natural drive***

How similar are the mechanisms of natural drive to synthetic drive systems? As the survivors of generations of counter selection, are natural drivers more robust than synthetic ones? Or are they limited by mutations where the designers of synthetic drivers are not?

### ***Evolutionary impacts of drive***

Theory suggests drive has major impacts on meiosis and gametogenesis, and may be a major reason for recombination itself. Has drive really had this much impact? Drive has also been proposed as a mechanism for promoting speciation by rapidly generating idiosyncratic differences between populations in reproductive genes, but the evidence is not yet conclusive. Finally, does drive really cause population or even species extinctions, and if so has this species-level selection impacted traits in extant organisms?









Figure 2

[Click here to download Figure Figure\\_2.jpg](#)

